UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,368	09/23/2003	Takafumi Noguchi	Q75436	9196
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 12/15/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			СНОІ, ЈАСОВ Ү	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2885	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/667,368	NOGUCHI, TAKAFUMI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JACOB Y. CHOI	2885
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>JACOB Y. CHOI</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Dion R. Ferguson</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 December 2008	Time: <u>11:00 AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	he examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Jacob Y Choi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2885	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: ambiguous claimed limitations of "... a minimum light-emission value is greater than 0% and equal to or less than 50% of a maximum light-emission value", were discussed.